SUPPLIED FOR SUPPL

′

FOR PUBLICATIONS: | 0

# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN RE THE ESTATE OF Civil Action No. 89-1041

DOLORES C. CASTRO

DECISION AND ORDER

This matter came before the Court on June 29, 1993 for a hearing on the claim of Claimant Juan Q. Norita to ownership of two parcels of real property originally owned by Decedent Dolores C. Castro, by virtue of a warranty deed executed by one of Decedent's children. The Administrator claims that the deed is void and that the parcels passed to two of Decedent's grandchildren by partida.

#### I. FACTS

Dolores C. Castro had nine children, all now deceased but one. On January 12, 1972, one of her children, Jose C. Castro, executed a warranty deed to Claimant, purporting to convey two parcels of land, described as Lot Numbers 006 D 25 and 006 D 26, located in Garapan, Saipan. See Claimant's Exh. A. According to the Administrator, Mr. Castro had no authority to execute this

conveyance; and it is undisputed that he had no legal title to the parcels when he conveyed them. At most, Mr. Castro had an unadjudicated one-ninth interest in the parcels at the time.

In 1973, all nine children of Decedent executed quitclaim deeds to the two parcels in favor of two of Decedent's grandchildren, Remedio C. Guerrero (Lot 006 D 25) and Vicente I. Castro (Lot 006 D 26). See Administrator's Exhs. 3-9, 12-14. Remedio Guerrero and Vicente Castro obtained Certificates of Title to the respective parcels in 1973. Administrator's Exhs. 10, 15. Vicente Castro deeded his parcel to Candido I. Castro in 1981, who obtained a Certificate of Title to Lot 006 D 26 that same year. Administrator's Exhs. 16, 17.

At the evidentiary hearing, the Administrator introduced testimony that Decedent's children quitclaimed their interests in this property in order to give effect to a partida announced by. Decedent sometime in the 1950's, which gave the two Garapan parcels to grandchildren living with Decedent. However, the Petition for Decree of Final Distribution does not mention any partida claim, but rather requests that ownership of the two parcels be divided in nine equal shares among Decedent's nine children.

# II. <u>ISSUE</u>

Two issues are presented for the Court's determination:

1. What legal consequences, if any, flowed from the January 12, 1972 warranty deed executed by Jose C. Castro in favor of Claimant?

\_

# III. ANALYSIS

### A. THE 1972 WARRANTY DEED

A writing may profess to pass title on its face and yet not do so, either due to lack of title in the person making it or from some type of defective conveyance. Repeki v. MAC Homes, Ltd., No. 90-002 (N.M.I., Mar. 14, 1991), slip op. at 13 n.13 (citing Munkres v. Chatmon, 599 P.2d 314, 316 (Kan. Ct. App. 1979). Under Commonwealth law, where the grantor of a deed does not possess (and does not later acquire) title, the deed is void and unenforceable. See Estate of Kaipat, 3 CR 884 (N.M.I. Super. Ct. 1989) (deed void because not all heirs consented to transfer as required under Carolinian custom); Estate of Torres, 1 CR 237 (D.N.M.I. App. Div. 1981); Estate of Ramon de Castro, 3 CR 28 (Com. Tr. Ct. 1987). This rule accords with the common law of the United States. See, e.g., Slaughter v. Qualls, 162 S.W.2d 671, 675 (Tex. 1942) (deed may be regular on its face yet void where grantor had no capacity to execute it).

None of these cases, however, address the validity of a deed where the grantor possesses a <u>partial</u> interest in the property. In that situation, the grantor is said to pass whatever estate he or she owns. In *Boys v. Long*, 268 P.2d 890, 293 (Okla. 1954), the court held that a warranty deed conveys grantor's interest in the property, and "the fact that he may own less than the entire fee does not prevent his passing title, by said deed, to the interest he does own." See also Smith v. St. Charles, 552 S.W.2d 60, 62

(Mo. Ct. App. 1977) (where grantor held leasehold interest, warranty deed conveyed only leasehold); Holmes v. Holmes, 447 S.W.2d 432, 424 (Tex. Ct. App. 1969) (where grantor held only life estate under terms of unprobated joint will with deceased wife, deed of property to third person conveyed only life estate in one-half of property).

Here, it is undisputed that Jose C. Castro did not have full title to the parcels when he executed the warranty deed to Claimant, nor did he acquire title later. Mr. Castro did, however, possess a one-ninth interest in the property as one of the heirs of Decedent. The facts are thus analogous to Holmes, supra, 447 S.W.2d at 424. This Court therefore holds that Claimant received a one-ninth interest in the Garapan properties by virtue of the 1972 warranty deed from Jose C. Castro. 1/2

#### B. PARTIDA

The Administrator introduced the testimony Decedent's grandchildren Remedio Guerrero and Candido Castro, that Decedent executed a partida sometime in the mid-1950's, giving the Garapan parcels to the grandchildren who had lived in her household. Quitclaim deeds were also introduced, wherein Decedent's children conveyed their interests in the Garapan property to the grandchildren. Administrator's Exhs. 3-9, 12-14

Claimant may have other remedies as well. According to the Restatement of Restitution, § 24, cmt. "e," states that "[i]f a buyer accepts a [defective] conveyance with warranties, his action is on the warranties." In the deed, Mr. Castro warranted title to Claimant. Claimant may be entitled to damages at law for breach of this covenant of warranty.

testimonial evidence."

(D.N.M.I. App. 1982).

fabrication aimed at defeating Claimant's claim. Second, the two witnesses who testified to the partida's existence were young children at the time of its alleged execution, sometime in the 1950's. Moreover, their testimony was vague as to the date the partida took place and as to other details of claimed event.

Third, the quitclaim deeds executed by Decedent's children are equally well explained as reactions to Jose C. Castro's unauthorized deed to Claimant. It is clear that Decedent's other children knew of the conveyance by August 1972, as they had by that date contacted the Land Commission and registered their objection to the conveyance. See Administrator's Exh. 1. In sum, the evidence here falls short of establishing that a partida

A court's determination of whether a decedent made a partida

Estate of Taisakan, 1 CR 328,

Weighing the probative value of the

334

entails "careful assessment and balancing of documentary and

proffered evidence, the Court finds it insufficient to establish

a partida. First, the Administrator's Petition failed to mention

such a partida, instead requesting distribution of the properties

into nine shares. This fact raises the distinct possibility that

the testimony affirming the existence of a partida was a post-hoc

23

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

occurred.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

24

For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby ORDERS:

25 26

C. Castro, in particular the property described as Lot Nos. 006 D

An eight-ninths undivided share of the estate of Dolores

27

25 and 006 D 26, is hereby distributed to the heirs of Dolores C.

28

Castro, with the exception of the estate of Jose C. Castro.

2. A one-ninth undivided share of the estate of Dolores C. Castro is hereby distributed to Claimant Juan C. Norita.

So ORDERED this 16 day of November, 1993.

MIGUEL (5. DEMAPAN, Associate Judge